


N61331.AR.001781
NSA PANAMA CITY
5090.3a

MINUTES AND AGENDA FOR PARTNERING TEAM MEETING DATED 17 DECEMBER 2009
CSS PANAMA CITY FL
12/17/2009
TETRA TECH

**PARTNERING MEETING AGENDA
NSA PANAMA CITY
December 17, 2009
PANAMA CITY (ST. ANDREWS STATE PARK), FLORIDA
(Draft, Revision #2)**

**Leader: John Winters
Scribe: Jacqueline Strobl
Timekeeper: Michael Clayton
Guests: Rico Latham, Larry Smith, Rich May**

	Item	Description	Presenter	Time (Eastern)	Category
	1	Check-In/ Introductions/ New Members/ Opening Remarks/ Head Count and Proxies/ Guests/	John W.	10:00 – 10:30	Info
	2	Action Item & Parking Lot Review/ Approve minutes/Agenda changes/ Review Team Charter/ Ground Rules	John W.	10:30 – 10:50	Info
	3	Building 278 Update and Pier Renovations	John S./Larry	10:50 – 11:05	Status
	4	Building 325 Update	John S./Larry	11:05 – 11:20	Status
	5	G300 update and path forward	Rico/Larry	11:20 – 11:40	Status
	6	AOC 2 update and path forward	John S./Larry	11:40 – 11:55	Status
		Lunch	All	11:55 – 1:15	Fun
	7	Training	Facilitator/Gus	1:15 – 2:05	Educational
		Break	All	2:05 – 2:20	Needed
	8	South Dock update and path forward	John S./Amy	2:20 – 2:55	Status
	9	SMWU 10/AOC 1 GW LTM update and free product detected at AOC 1	John S./Larry	2:55 – 3:05	Status
	10	Tier II Update	Rich	3:05 – 3:15	Info
		Break	All	3:15 – 3:25	Needed
	11	Corrective Action implementation at AOC 1 and SMWUs 2, 3, 10	Arturo	2:25 – 3:30	Status
	12	CAMP/Exit Strategy Review	John S./Tom	3:30 – 3:45	Concur
	13	Meeting Closeout – review action items, consensus items, +/-, next agenda	John W.	3:45 – 4:00	Info

Meeting Schedule? Next Meeting's Leader and Time Keeper are?

**PARTNERING MEETING MINUTES
NSA PANAMA CITY
Partnering Meeting
December 17, 2009**

Leader: John Winters
Scribe: Jacqueline Strobl
Timekeeper: Michael Clayton
Location: Panama City, Florida

Attendees:

Mike Clayton	NSA PC	John Winters	FDEP
Larry Smith	TtNUS	Rich May	TtNUS Tier II Link
Arturo McDonald	NSA PC	Gus Campana	Facilitator
John Schoolfield	NAVFAC SE		
Jacqueline Strobl	TtNUS (Scribe)		

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
Check-In – John Winters Check-In/ Introductions/ New Members/ Opening Remarks/ Head Count and Proxies/ Guests	<p>Each meeting attendee provided a brief personal update including highlights from the past year.</p> <p>Rico Latham and Tom Johnston were unable to attend this partnering meeting. Tom Johnston participated via teleconference after lunch.</p> <p>Larry Smith will serve as Tom Johnston's proxy. John Schoolfield will serve as Erico Latham's proxy.</p>
Action Item & Parking Lot Review/ Approve Minutes/Agenda changes/ Review Team Charter/ Ground Rules – John Winters	<p>The team reviewed and updated the action item list. The team noted that review of the previous meeting minutes did not include parking lot discussion. The parking lot should be utilized as a means of reminding the team of issues that need to be reviewed annually, or topics that require review at a later date.</p>
Building 278 Update and Pier Renovations – John Schoolfield & Larry Smith	<p>Larry Smith distributed handouts to the team and provided a Facility 278 Update including details concerning Pier Renovations (see power point presentation).</p> <p>John Winters noted that he would like information concerning on base drinking water wells and their construction details to be represented in either report text or maps. Mike Clayton stated that though the wells have not yet been abandoned, they are not being used. Proper well abandonment is pending funding. Mr. Winters replied that he would like this information noted in reports.</p> <p>Mr. Smith noted that there have been 3 consecutive quarters of sampling with only one groundwater sample that exceeded</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>FDEP criteria; this exceedance was MW-6 where 1-methylnaphthelen was detected at 0.033 mg/L which exceeds the GCTL of 0.028 mg/L. An additional quarter of sampling</p> <p>will take place, however, it should be noted that since the last sampling event, the pier has been reconstructed. The next report should show 4 quarters (1 year) of data to demonstrate that the groundwater is not impacted.</p> <p>Mr. Winters stated that in order to show that groundwater is not impacted there would need to be 4 quarters of sampling following the remedial action and at least 2 consecutive clean quarters. The initial pump and treat/SVE remedial action for this site was completed in December 2006.</p> <p>Mr. Winters noted that he would provide an example PARM/SRCR which would show what/how information FDEP would like to see presented.</p> <p>Action Item #A-12-09-01: John Winters - Send out the example (PARM/SRCR) to the team. (Due 12/24/09)</p> <p>An example PARM/SRCR was discussed briefly and Mr. Winters noted the benefits of having a complete sampling history and suggested that the history be reviewed to determine if the SRCR could be submitted based on the last year's findings.</p>
<p>Building 325 Sampling Results - John Schoolfield</p>	<p>Currently work at Building 325 consists of sampling 3 selected wells (MW-8, MW-23, and MW-26). Mr. Winters had requested sampling of 5 additional wells (MW-7, MW-10, MW-15, MW-19, and MW-21).</p> <p>John Schoolfield stated that sampling of these additional wells had been completed and the analytical data had been received. Mr. Schoolfield displayed an Aerostar chart depicting sampling trends. Exceedances as well as sampling frequency were noted.</p> <p>Mr. Winters noted that historically/previously 2 wells contained free product. He stated that while it appears that groundwater may be clean here, he was concerned about the soils or leachability. Mr. Winters stated that it should not be assumed that this is finished just yet.</p> <p>The team briefly discussed the SVE system at the site. Mr. Winters stated that he would like this information to be included in the report and noted that in previous reports there had been discussion of a lot of smear over the area. Mr. Winters noted that he was concerned that sampling had not</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>been in the right location and stressed the importance of examining all available data.</p> <p>Mr. Smith stated that existing data should be reviewed in order to better understand what has already been done and then combine that data with the current data so that the spikes can be explained. The observed spikes lead to the conclusion that we missed something. We need to determine what happened and why.</p> <p>Mr. Winters stated that the data being presented makes it appear as though we should be finished here, but that he did not think that was the case.</p> <p>Further team discussion noted that the importance of reviewing historical information and FDEP rules 62-770 etc. The example document should serve as guidance. FDEP's rules should be understood and applied to SAPs and reports. Questions concerning the interpretation of the rules can be answered by Mr. Winters.</p>
<p>G300 Update and Path Forward - Larry Smith</p>	<p>Mr. Smith provided a G300 update. Though unexpected difficulties were encountered during soil sampling in the form of roots and flat concrete objects, the soil sampling portion of the plan had been completed. Larry noted the areas sampled on both figures and photos (see power point presentation). No samples were collected at depths greater than 8.5 feet. The water table was encountered at approximately 8.0 feet bls and muddy/wet soils could not be lifted to the surface due to water surface tension causing suction.</p> <p>Mr. Smith displayed a diagram which showed 6 sample locations with their corresponding FID results. Unfortunately concrete was encountered at depth at boring SB003; because of this, a sample from SB004 was sent in instead. Contamination is not observed below 5 feet in soil as shown by the soil samples FID results.</p> <p>There were no exceedances of VOAs or PAHs, however, there were TRPH exceedances in three soil samples. Mr. Winters asked whether or not they had done fractionation. Mr. Smith replied that they had not, but that if Mr. Schofield (later Mr. Latham concurred) approved, he could check and see if the lab could run a fractionation.</p> <p>Mr. Smith noted that all the wells will be sampled again in the 4th quarter.</p> <p>Mr. Winters stated that he had sent his approval on the draft work plan.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Mr. Smith explained that the planned path forward was to demonstrate that it is technically impractical to remediate the site. If things don't change much from the present conditions, the most cost effective option would be a LUC. At this point we are headed toward a LUC.</p>
<p>AOC 2 Update and Path Forward - Larry Smith</p>	<p>Mr. Smith provided a power point presentation update on AOC2. Two years ago, baseline sampling was performed; a year later groundwater was sampled again. TtNUS returned to the site in November and is currently waiting on data validation from this sampling event. Currently 5 wells are sampled on a quarterly basis. The source area well has highest number of analytes detected, but no exceedances of GCTLs. No sheen was observed in any wells, so no problems are anticipated.</p> <p>Mr. Winters asked whether or not sampling had taken place in the utility corridor. Mr. Smith replied that the wells located in the utility corridor had been abandoned at a previous date. There is no current means of sampling groundwater in that area only piezometers are present. The original work plan included soil sampling in the utility corridor, but this has not taken place yet.</p> <p>Rich May noted that the baseline and 1st quarter of sampling have taken place and that the information corresponding to the 2nd quarter of sampling will be included in the next upcoming report.</p> <p>Mr. Winters asked whether or not the work performed by CH2MHill had been redone. Mr. Schofield replied that it had. Mr. May noted that soil sampling had taken place prior to backfilling the excavation area.</p> <p>Mr. Winters expressed concern regarding the sampling method details, noting that he wasn't sure the samples had been collected close enough to the water table; there had been conflicting reports concerning the sampling method. Mr. Winters also noted his concern regarding the leachability in these areas. (The subject locations are the 4 soil samples collected by CH2MHill after the excavation was closed to confirm sidewall sample data.)</p> <p>Mr. Winters said that a NFA for the site could not be achieved with the current conditions. Mr. Smith noted that the intent was to remove the free product from the area to allow a forward path RMOII. The goal/intent was to get the site to the point to where LUCs could be applied.</p> <p>Mr. Winters indicated that pursuing RMOII would be acceptable, but that he would like to check the corridor.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Mr. Winters, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Schoolfield began to review the figure depicting the piezometers and abandoned wells in the utility corridor. It was noted that fiber optics corridors and other utilities such were located from the fence line to the utility corridor.</p> <p>Mr. Winters noted that if the plan was to go the RMOII route and no one would be digging/working in the utility corridor area anyway, then he would be fine with that. He noted that unless informed upfront the assumption is that the end goal is NFA without LUCs. If the plan was to pursue NFA without controls, then leachability would need to be addressed.</p> <p>Mr. Smith noted that the problem had been that the contamination had been spotty; exceedances of applicable FDEP criteria were sprinkled through the site at depths of 3 feet. The thought was that meeting the criteria of removing the free product and moving towards LUCs would be more cost effective.</p> <p>Mr. Smith pointed out the location of the fuel tanks near Building 400. Interspersed contamination hotspots were spread over a large area. Groundwater exceedances were not observed; over time apparently the groundwater had naturally attenuated contamination but the soil had not. Contamination at the site is located in soil between 3 and 6 feet deep; when you get to the water table it's gone.</p> <p>Mr. Smith indicated that previous reports had included SPLP data. When the LUCs are written up, they will indicate the need to keep the current cover (parking lot) in place.</p> <p>Mr. Winters noted the importance of using the term cover instead of cap, since the word cap implies an engineered cap.</p> <p>Further team discussion took place concerning the possible benefit of installing piezometers near the old free product locations in order to demonstrate a lack of free product and provide justification to show that a removal action would be unnecessary. Mr. Smith noted that soil sampling was part of the work plan adding piezometers would not be a significant problem.</p> <p>Mr. Schoolfield proposed that he and Mr. Smith could work together to summarize the information and come up with a plan.</p>
Lunch	Break. In order to accommodate the travel timing needs of those involved in the South Dock Update, the schedule was

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>adjusted. The Facilitator Training presentation and South Dock Update timeslots were exchanged.</p> <p>Guests Amy Twitty of CH2MHill and Vick Cribbs from the NSA Panama City base joined the meeting for the South Dock Update and Path Forward discussion.</p>
<p>South Dock Update and Path Forward - John Schoolfield & Amy Twitty</p>	<p>Amy Twitty provided a South Dock Update via power point presentation. A brief discussion took place concerning the site location and description.</p> <p>The MILCON project extended the dock out a couple feet with the installation of new sheet pilings. All the sheet piling is in place and the soil anchors will be installed next week. By next week all of the underground work should be completed.</p> <p>The next area of concern is Building 597. This area will be worked on right after the first of the year. Ms. Twitty noted that when they'd first come around the bend during Phase B, approximately 55 yd³ of contaminated soil was encountered. The estimated date of completion of the entire project is March 2010.</p> <p>As this work was being performed a sheen was observed on the water and soil contamination was encountered. Leftover money from the AOC2 project was utilized for the South Dock impacted soil removal project.</p> <p>Harry Pepper & Associates (HPA) had noted an odor, so Mr. Schoolfield had Aerostar check out the area. Impacted soil was encountered east of Building 597; headspace readings were taken south of the building. Ms. Twitty noted exceedances in SB-1 and SB-6. Soil samples were collected for TPH speciation.</p> <p>CH2MHill came out to the site to help determine where contamination might be the greatest. A 20 ft. wide area was in the process of being excavated by HPA, so the decision was made to take advantage of the excavation in progress. Because soils near the groundwater table were saturated, the samples were speciated. Hotspots were found at SB-6 and SB-1. During FID readings, SB-7 was the only sample that failed the speciation. Strong hydrocarbon odor was noted.</p> <p>Ms. Twitty noted that the groundwater in this area is tidally influenced. There were no exceedances at the 4-6ft sample depth range. Sample information had been collected while the excavation was occurring. It was noted that the scale of the sample locations were actually north of the area that HPA was excavating. In November CH2MHill returned to the site</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>and collected 8 additional borings. Samples from boring SB-22 had high readings. In total it was estimated that there were about a thousand tons of impacted soil.</p> <p>Mr. Smith noted that TtNUS had mobilized to the site for visit/observation on October 8th and November 16th. He observed eight inch cores were drilled through the relief platform for tiebacks which allowed floating product with contaminated groundwater to enter the trench box area with high tide.</p> <p>Mr. Smith noted that beneath the relief platform floating product, likely diesel oil, was retained in inverted boxes approximately 12 by 20 feet with a concrete skirt 12 inches deep – housing tiebacks - on three sides preventing entrapped product from escaping. Treatment if any would be required of each separate box. There are about 48 separate boxes along the south pier.</p> <p>Ms. Twitty stated that they could put together a tech memo and get it to Mr. Winters.</p> <p><u>Path Forward:</u></p> <p>The construction work on the south pier is nearly complete. There is a bit of soil removal in front of Building 597 that still needs to be addressed (pending disposal decision); this area will be paved over. Though it has been recognized that there is contamination beneath the platform, it may be technically impracticably to remediate it. The decision may be made to move towards a LUC.</p> <p>Mr. Clayton asked whether or not this would be solely a GW LUC since soil remediation had taken place. Mr. Clayton explained that a lot of work could be performed within the upper 5 feet of soil.</p> <p>Mr. Smith described the area to be included in the LUC as a rectangular box. In the vertical dimension top could be five feet deep the bottom 4 feet below the top. The box would/ could be about twenty feet from the pier wall to the edge of the relief platform and along the pier encompassing the approximate 48 inverted 12x20 foot boxes.</p>
<p>Facilitation Training - Gus Campana</p>	<p>Gus Campana provided a Facilitator Training presentation entitled “Elf Management” based in part on <u>The Leadership Secrets of Santa Claus</u> (see power point presentation).</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
<p>SMWU 10/AOC1 - John Schoolfield & Larry Smith</p>	<p>Mr. Winters noted that several ongoing action items still needed to be addressed, specifically the FDEP comments from back in April.</p> <p>Tom Johnston stated that there had been a contracting issue because the AOC1/SMWU10 situation was actually handled under other smaller contractors.</p> <p>Mr. Schoolfield explained that contracting had been held up in acquisition due to other priorities placed ahead of it.</p> <p>Action Item #A-12-09-02: Tom Johnston & Larry Smith – Respond to FDEP comments (See previous meeting minutes for previous action items).</p> <p>Mr. Smith began providing an update of AOC 1 noting that the EMAC were surprised to find floating product in several of the wells, which were thought to be ready for abandonment, around Building 399. The initial work was performed by Battelle included bioslurping, during which a significant amount 53,000 lbs of material was removed. One of the things noticed in reviewing the Battelle report was that they had expected that there would be residual product in these wells in the future. We are now observing what they had indicated that they'd expect. In the past sampling has taken place for DCE and DCA; concentrations have been low enough to file successfully for a Statement of Basis.</p> <p>Mr. Smith went on to say that it may be expedient to transfer the site to FDEP's UST program. There are a lot of wells already in position, so perhaps a SAR could help determine what contamination is present. Our understanding of the site could be optimized with the addition of new wells and sampling of existing wells.</p> <p>Mr. Johnston noted that DCE was non-detect in the last couple of monitoring events. This may be an indication that both upgradient and the area towards the shoreline are non-detect.</p> <p>Mr. Johnson went on to say that it didn't really look like a petroleum site and it doesn't look like it's threatening offshore. Because we are encountering free product as predicted after the biosplurge, it may be worth it to go out there and bail the free product, then see how fast its recharge rate is.</p> <p>Arturo McDonald asked whether or not the permit would need to be modified if this is changed to a monitoring site. He also asked whether or not this would change the LUC.</p> <p>Mr. Johnston replied that the surface soil and groundwater LUC encompasses the area where there are wells that contained free product and explained the LUC boundaries.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>Mr. Clayton and Mr. Winters both stated that the LUCs wouldn't need to be changed. So the RCRA permit would not need to be changed.</p> <p>Regarding moving AOC 1 to the UST program, Mr. Winters replied that he didn't know if that was something that could be done. Mr. Winters requested that this be put in the response letter so that he could look into it.</p> <p>Mr. Smith suggested monitoring the wells after bailing for two weeks in a row, and then moving on to discussing a path forward based on that info.</p> <p>Mr. Johnston noted that there was an annual monitoring well program on AOC1, with the next scheduled event would take place either this or next month. He asked whether there was enough time to check the wells and get the free product info.</p> <p>Mr. Smith replied that there had been discussion on whether or not a work plan was necessary.</p> <p>Mr. Johnston stated that a letter work plan should suffice. The wells could be checked/identified and groundwater measurements could be recorded.</p> <p>Mr. Smith noted that this could take place before mid February.</p> <p>Action Item #A-12-09-03: Tom Johnston & Larry Smith – Write letter plan to do measure & bailing free product and ground truthing. Plan to sample during end of January.</p>
Tier II Update- Rich May	<p>Mr. May provided a Tier II update concerning the quarterly meeting held 2 weeks ago in Orlando. Tier II discussed FDEPs DSMOA funding. Discussion also took place about how sites were proceeding as well as the need to continue to identify the workload so that the info can be communicated to FDEP. The funding situation was also discussed.</p> <p>Mr. May noted that there had been discussion concerning a long list of people planning on retiring in the next few years. Tier II also took into consideration that the position that Arthur, EPA's equivalent to Camille, has is really representing Tier II. FDEP expressed that they valued their input and would like to see them involved. Mike Singletary may be brought onto the team as well. This may lead to rotating attendance between Helen, Robbie, and Mike.</p> <p>Several bases were discussed, but NSA Panama City was not included in this discussion. The SMP for Petroleum has an estimated 2010 submittal date. John, Tom, and Rich have</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p>all worked on it together. The only comment made was concerning a missing actual date.</p> <p>Eventually we will have facilitator evaluation forms. NSA Panama City may need to present at one of the upcoming meetings. Tier II doesn't meet again until March.</p>
<p>Corrective Action Implementation at AOC 1 and SMWUs 2, 3, 10 – Arturo McDonald</p>	<p>Mr. McDonald began presenting an updated on the Corrective Action Implementation.</p> <p>SMWU 2 LUC:</p> <p>Mr. Schoolfield noted that the decision had been made that a public notice would be unnecessary. Mr. Winters stated that</p> <p>the remedy was not being changed, LUCs have been reduced, not expanded, so there doesn't appear to be a need for a new public notice.</p> <p>Mr. McDonald asked for a letter stating that the public notice was not necessary.</p> <p>Action Item #A-12-09-04: John Winters - Send out a letter concerning notice of receipt of yearly certification forms; Comment on SMU2 LUC change (public notice not necessary). Due 12/24/09</p> <p>Mr. Clayton stated that he didn't know there had been delay pending an official response. Mr. McDonald noted that a formal response may not be required, but that it is probably a good idea.</p> <p>Mr. Johnston asked whether or not the certificates needed to be included in the administrative record.</p> <p>Mr. Winters asked whether or not formal response letters were included.</p> <p>Mr. Johnston stated that they had been, but that it had been unclear whether or not the certificates, generated annually, should be included, or where they should be filed.</p> <p>Mr. Winters replied that the RCRA permit might provide clarification, but that he had thought that this would be a formal document in it of itself.</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
CAMP/ Exit Strategy Review – Tom Johnston & John Schoolfield	<p><u>CAMP</u></p> <p>Mr. Johnston stated that he didn't believe any CAMP updates were necessary at this time. Dates have been entered for the Statement of Basis and the corrective actions have all been implemented.</p> <p>Mr. May replied that the only changes to the CAMP would need to be permanent changes.</p> <p><u>Exit Strategy</u></p> <p>Mr. May noted that the only thing that needed to be revised were the status updates.</p> <p>Mr. Johnston noted that there shouldn't be any new changes and that the highlighted cells represented the most recent changes.</p> <p>Mr. Schoolfield made the suggestion that the team thoroughly review the backgrounds on each of the sites; presentations on each site's history and could be included in the meetings, spaced out over several meetings.</p> <p>Mr. Smith noted that another possibility would be to create a summary cheat sheet to hit the main highlights for each site. A section could be included to state the goal/objective.</p>
Meeting Closeout – review action items, consensus items, +/-, next agenda – John S.	<p>The team began meeting closeout by reviewing all the new action items.</p> <p>Mr. Campana provided facilitator feedback noting that timing had been a little difficult/rushed, but that overall it had been an effective meeting with great communication.</p> <p>+</p> <p>Great communication/camaraderie Participation No violations of ground rules</p> <p>Tom attending by phone John W. participated well as leader and regulator Fridge in the room Good facility</p> <p>Δ</p> <p>Timing/lunch delay – too much in one day Start earlier/time zone difference</p>

Item	Discussion/Status/Actions
	<p><u>Next Meeting</u> Leader: Mike Clayton Timekeeper: Arturo MacDonald March 24, 2010 @ PC or Tallahassee – TBD 9am EST (alternate date 23rd – can't start earlier than 8:30 CST when park opens)</p>

Action Items
NSA Panama City Partnering Team
December 17, 2009

Action Item No.	Responsible Party	Status	Due Date	Action Item
A-12-09-01	John Winters	Ongoing	12/24/09	Send out the example (PARM/SRCR) to the team.
A-12-09-02	Tom Johnston & Larry Smith	Ongoing	?	Respond to FDEP comments (See previous meeting minutes for previous action items).
A-12-09-03	Tom Johnston & Larry Smith	Ongoing	?	Write letter plan to measure & bail free product and ground truthing. Plan to sample during end of January.
A-12-09-04	John Winters	Ongoing	12/24/09	Send out a letter concerning notice of receipt of yearly LUC certification forms; Comment on SMU2 LUC change (public notice not necessary).
A-08-09-06	John Winters	Ongoing		Find out who is putting together approved pit list and see if they can add to it if they sample to determine if it is clean.
A-08-09-07	Larry Smith and John Schoolfield	Ongoing		Respond to John Winters' comments regarding AOC1.
A-08-09-08	John Winters	Ongoing		Forward comments to SMP and ES to team.
A-08-09-09	John Winters, John Schoolfield	Ongoing		Find Tom Johnston's email about changing the boundaries and Statement of Basis and forward it to the team.
A-08-09-10	John Schoolfield	Ongoing	11/10/09	Task Tetra Tech to do award submittal for FY10 at the next meeting.